

as that the cup of conciliation is exhausted. I shall say

nothing of that. I will not utter menace, nor will I indicate the end of this fearful question. We have accepted the principle of compromise, and we have no compromise that has been proposed. Indeed, we have no compromise to let this question pass by, on a point of honor; as yet gentlemen come out and accuse those who have maintained those compromises, and manifested a desire to defend those compromises, of a design to sever the Union. Oh, yes; we are the ones of a design to sever the Union! In disposition to sever the different portions of this Union! It is the wolf taking office at the lamb, because he contradicted him, in saying he had not murdered the water in drinking it.

The South, at the time of the formation of this confederacy, made sacrifices, and deprived herself of the sceptre. She parted with the sceptre, when she consented to the formation of this Union—when she gave up to the North the power of regulating commerce by a mere majority vote. She gave up the right to go into the history of this matter, as well as to appeal, and she has no right to

[illegible]

There are occasions on which I might expect statesmen and patriots to elevate themselves above those irresponsible influences, but the day has elapsed, I am afraid, when such men are to be found. And in making this statement, I do not mean to cast a cloud upon the character of Mr. Lincoln. I will not deprive the North of an iota of credit that is her due. The past is secure, and I speak of it only in an historical point of view; but I will not sit here and hear doctrines expressed which, in their consequences, would degrade a people, the confederacy, and deprive posterity of the rights which we have ourselves inherited.

from Ohio, because as I have attributed to it an influence, the latter itself will furnish the evidence upon which I have based my opinion.

The Secretary read as follows:

CINCINNATI, 1849.

My Dear Sir: I observe indications in various quarters of a disposition on the part of influential gentlemen to interpose difficulties in the way of cordial union between the line of lineal democracy, by insisting on conditions to which the latter cannot agree without the sacrifice of principles which they hold far dearer than party success.

The free democracy, holding, in common with the old line democracy, the cordial and essential doctrines of the democratic faith, believe that the time has come for the application of the principle of democracy to the subject of slavery, as well as to the subjects of currency and trade.

Slavery is the worst form of despotism. The ownership of slaves is the worst form of robbery.

It is the most abominable sin known to human civilization.

All men have equal rights by nature, and that the only legitimate object of government is to maintain and secure these rights, can doubt that slaveholding is grossly inconsistent with democratic principles.

It is not necessary to advert to the circumstances which, for many years, prevented either of the great parties of the country from making any serious attempt to change the policy, so enough that circumstances are now changed. The acquisition of Mexican territories has presented the question of slavery in a new and more important aspect. The acquisition and contentment of a new slave territory as slave territory now it seeks to subject free territory to the blight of slavery. This enormous pretension has led to a more general examination of the constitution, and has brought to the surface the element to the slave system; and that examination has fastened the conviction on the minds of thousands and hundreds of thousands, that the government has no right to establish a boundary prohibiting slavery in the territories, and to exert all its legitimate and constitutional powers to limit, localize, and discourage it, and especially to prohibit its extension in all places within the sphere of its exclusive jurisdiction.

This is the conviction of free democracy. They have announced it over and over again, and their policy will undoubtedly conform.

Now, what is to hinder the reception of this faith by the millions of Americans who are not yet converted to the frank avowal of it? What should interfere with manly and

straightforward action in consistency with it!

I can see but one thing—the alliance, so called, with the slaveholders, is a fatal error, and that political support and influence in a presidential election.

Now, it is very certain that no consideration of mere expediency may justify the alliance, but to reformerism from carrying out its own principles; and it seems to me equally certain that political expediency and duty at this time coincide.

Ever and anon will be the cost to the democracy of the alliance of the slaveholders in a presidential campaign!

To terminate this question, it must first be seen what the slaveholders demand as the price of their alliance. This demand is—

It is non-interference upon the subject of slavery. That is, so long as the slaveholders are not disturbed, they are willing to let the Union, which has been approved by a number of Democratic States, stand as it is, and universally, I believe, as well, it might be, in the slave States.

Now, it is my deliberate opinion that it is utterly impracticable to unite the democracy on this platform in the free States.

The free democracy can never accede to it; and maintaining, as they do, the cardinal doctrines of democracy and occupying, as they will, a bold and independent position on the subject of slavery, they will not be deceived by those who hold boldness and independence will rally around them in such numbers that it will be utterly impossible for compromising democracy to be able to outvote them in the choice of free States and they must, as heretofore, divide the free States with compromising whigism. Success, therefore, on the non-intervention platform, is for the old democracy quite out of the question.

The free democracy believe in non-intervention, such as the constitution requires—non-intervention by Congress with the legislation of the States on the subject of slavery. But our democracy believe in non-intervention by the constitution of the country, warrants non-intervention by Congress with slavery in territories and elsewhere, without the limits of free States. We believe in non-intervention by the national government. Slavery in such territory or places must, under a strict construction of the constitution, exist at all. Slavery in such territory or places ought, at least, to

I have regretted to see certain expressions attributed to John Van Buren, calculated to revive unpleasant feelings—such as that the national government is a "slave government,"—and that the national democratic party is in process of regeneration—in progress, obeying that law of progress which all its children recognize, from the old platform of "free labor, free land, free trade," to the new platform of slavery restriction and discouragement. It seems to me that the party in the free States ought at once to advance to the Jeffersonian ground, and there unite in one coalition with the party in the slave States, and thus advance to the Jeffersonian party in the slave States advance to the more ground of the Jeffersonian party in the free States. The party in the advancing, some may desert and go over to the enemy, but the party in the retreating, some may desert and go into a temporary misapprehension. Let it be so. The compensation will be found in the concentration, unanimity, the invincibility, of the united democracy in the free State. The thoughtless and the timid, who are not yet ready to sacrifice their principles, even in the slave States, the democracy can elect for national candidates, under such circumstances, in despite of all opposition.

Readers of this review will find a strong conviction that it will prove their correctness. I am a democrat unreservedly, and I feel earnestly solicited for the success of the democratic party.

erate organization and the truth of the principles, the doctrines of the democratic republic, the subjects of slavery, and a social policy, command the entire assent of my mind. But I cannot, while boldly asserting their principles, in reference to these subjects, shrink from their just application to slavery. I should feel guilty of shameful dereliction of duty if I did. You know what multitudes now sympathize with me, and how truly. It is this very fidelity to democratic principles which makes it impossible for them to compromise with slavery. What a melancholy spectacle it would be, to see the democratic party embracing